



COPY MAILED

SEP 29 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440-1022

In re Patent No. 7,488,343	:
Issued: February 10, 2009	: DECISION ON APPLICATION
Application No. 10/664,679	: FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Filed: September 16, 2003	:
Attorney Docket No. 10527-0462001 /	:
02-253	:

This is a decision on the "APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d)" filed April 9, 2009, requesting that the patent term adjustment determination for the above-identified patent be changed from seven hundred sixty-two (762) days to one thousand eighty-five (1085) days.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment is **DISMISSED**.

On February 19, 2009, the above-identified application matured into US Patent No. 7,488,343 with a patent term adjustment of 762 days. This request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See 37 CFR 1.705(d).

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

Patentees request recalculation of the patent term adjustment based on the decision in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentees assert that in view of the decision in Wyeth, they are entitled to an additional 410 days of patent term adjustment due to exceeding three year pendency.

The 410-day period is calculated based on the application having been filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on September 16, 2003 and a request for continued examination (RCE) having being filed on October 31, 2007. ¹ The filing of an RCE cuts-off the

¹The Office notes the RCE was filed on October 31, 2007, as indicated in the Image File Wrapper, not October 30, 2007, as shown on the PTA Calculations Sheet.

applicants' ability to accumulate any additional patent term adjustment against the three-year pendency provision, but does not otherwise affect patent term adjustment. 37 CFR § 1.703(b)(1).

Patentees assert that in addition to this 410 day period, they are entitled to a period of adjustment due to examination delay pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a), of 763 days for the failure by the Office to mail at least one of a notification under 35 U.S.C. 132 not later than fourteen months after the date on which the application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a), pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1).

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, it is the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay. Patentees do not dispute the period of reduction of 1 day for applicant delay.

Patentees assert that the total period of Office delay is the sum of the period of Three Years Delay to the filing of the RCE (410 days) and the period of Examination Delay (763 days) to the extent that these periods of delay are not overlapping.

Patentees contend that the period of Examination Delay and the Three Year Delay period overlap by 87 days.

Accordingly, patentees submit that the total period of Office Delay is 1086 days, which is the sum of the period of Three Year Delay (410 days) and the period of Examination Delay (763 days), reduced by the period of overlap (87 days). As such, patentees assert entitlement to a patent term adjustment of 1085 days ($410 + 763 (756 + 7)$ reduced by 87 overlap - 1 for applicant delay).

The Office agrees that as of the filing of the RCE on October 31, 2007, the application was pending three years and 410 days after its filing date. The Office agrees that the action detailed above was not taken within the specified time frame, and thus, a total period of adjustment of 763 days was entered for Office delay. At issue is whether patentees should accrue 410 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent, as well as 763 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that 410 days overlap. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

to the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 35 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See also *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

The current wording of § 1.703(f) was revised in response to the misinterpretation of this provision by a number of Patentees. The rule was slightly revised to more closely track the corresponding language of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). The relevant portion differs only to the extent that the statute refers back to provisions of the statute whereas the rule refers back to sections of the rule. This was not a substantive change to the rule nor did it reflect a change of the Office's interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

As stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed. The grounds specified in these sections cover the A) guarantee of prompt Patent and Trademark Office responses, B) guarantee of no more than 3-year application pendency, and C) guarantee or adjustments for delays due to interference, secrecy orders and appeals. A section by section analysis of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) specifically provides that:

Section 4402 imposes limitations on restoration of term. In general, pursuant to [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(2)(A)-(C), total adjustments granted for restorations under [35 U.S.C. 154](b)(1) are reduced as follows: (1) To the extent that there are multiple grounds for extending the term of a patent that may exist simultaneously (e.g., delay due to a secrecy order under [35 U.S.C.] 181 and administrative delay under [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(1)(A)), the term should not be extended for each ground of delay but only for the actual number of days that the issuance of a patent was delayed; See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,718²

As such, the period for over three-year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the date on which the application was filed overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the filing date of the application.

It is noted, however, that delays resulting in the Office's failure to meet the time frames specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) (the "fourteen-four-four-four" provisions) are not always overlapping with a delay resulting in the Office's failure to issue a patent within the three-year time frame specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) because not all

² The AIPA is title IV of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999 (S. 1948), which was incorporated and enacted as law as part of Pub. L. 106-113. The Conference Report for H.R. 3194, 106th Cong. 1st Sess. (1999), which resulted in Pub. L. 106-113, does not contain any discussion (other than the incorporated language) of S. 1948. A section-by-section analysis of S. 1948, however, was printed in the Congressional Record at the request of Senator Lott, See 145 Cong. Rec. S14,708-26 (1999)(daily ed. Nov. 17, 1999).

application pendency time is counted toward this three-year period. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii).

In this instance, all application pendency time is not counted toward the three-year period. A request for continued examination was filed on October 31, 2007. The period subsequent to the filing of the RCE is not included in the three-year time frame specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B). See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i). Thus, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period from September 16, 2003 to October 31, 2007. Thus, only the 756 days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the filing of the RCE are considered in determining overlap. The 7 days for Office delay occurring subsequent to the filing of the RCE is not considered. The 410 days attributed to Office delay pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(b) is determined to overlap with the 756 days attributed to Office delay pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1). 763 (756 + 7) days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed. Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered no additional days of patent term adjustment.

In view thereof, the Office affirms the revised determination of patent term adjustment at the time of the issuance of the patent is 762 days (763 (756 + 7) days of Office delay – 1 days of applicant delay).

Telephone inquiries specific to this decision should be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212.



Christina Tartera Donnell
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions